

# **BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

## **Minutes of January 21, 2014 Meeting**

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:09 p.m. on Tuesday, January 21, 2014.

**Present:** Rob Belisle, Jonathan Bahr, John Taylor, Ed Horne, Melanie Coyne, Travis Haston, Hal Hester, and Chad Askew

**Absent:** Bernice Cutler, Jon Wood and Kevin Silva

### **1. MINUTES APPROVED**

*The motion by Ed Horne, seconded by Hal Hester, to approve the December 17, 2013 meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

### **2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS**

No BDC member issues.

### **3. PUBLIC ISSUES AND COMMENTS**

No public issues and/or comments.

### **4. Code Enforcement 2014 CSS Survey**

This follows up December BDC meeting discussion with ED on 2014 survey questions and strategy. Now receive any final comments in shaping the 2014 customer survey.

### **5. BDC Budget Subcommittee work**

Preparing draft memo to budget subcommittee members; need budget subcommittee volunteers. Fy14 Budget SubComm volunteers were E Mann, Harry S, John T, Jon M, Trent H, Zeke A, Rob B. Currently planning on 3 meetings, about 2 – 3 hrs long; tentative dates;

- Friday, Feb 7, 11-2pm, Wednesday, Feb 26. 11am-2pm, Friday, March 14th, 10-2pm

Plan is that BDC March 21st meeting will be budget only. These are tentative dates. The final schedule may move around as the CM's office clarifies the Fy15 budget process, but we will work hard to hold those dates.

### **6. FY14 Mid-Year Numbers Report** (see handout e-mailed Friday)

All numbers are for the reporting period 7/1/2013 thru 12/31/2013

- **Revenue:**
  - Permit rev; \$10,661,052, above YTD permit fee rev projection (\$9,133,464) by \$1,527,588 or 16.7%
  - Other rev; \$1,781,406, above YTD permit fee rev projection (\$1,399,702) by \$381,704 or 27.3%
  - Total rev(\*); \$12,442,458, above YTD permit fee rev projection (10,533,166) by \$1,909,292 (18.1%)  
(\* ) excludes technology commercial surcharge funds
- **Permits:** comparison of Fy14 to Fy13 mid-year data
  - Residential permits total 24,441, up 17.4% from Fy13 (20,813)
    - Includes SF new construction permits total 1,517, up slightly from Fy13 (1,483)
  - Commercial permits total 14,969, up 1.85% from Fy13 (14,697)
    - Total permits at 42,214 up 11% from Fy13 (38,010)
- **Inspections:** comparison of Fy14 to Fy13 mid-year data
  - building – 36,416, up 25.4% from 29,027 on Dec. 31, 2012
  - electrical – 41,306, up 9.36% from 37,769 on Dec. 31, 2012
  - mechanical – 22,677, up 8.34% from 20,930 on Dec. 31, 2012
  - plumbing – 17,591, up 15.7% from 15,195 on Dec. 31, 2012
  - total-117,990, up 14.64% from 102,921, on Dec. 31, 2012
- **Inspection complete 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours:** 88.38% compared to 90.55% at 12/31/2012 (\*)  
(\* ) IRT report is being replaced with new report. See discussion in item 10.2.2.3.
- **Inspection pass rate:** 82.35%, compared to 84.54% at mid-year Fy13

- Plan review: overall OnSchedule av'g 92.625% on time or early, compared to 97.21% at mid-yr Fy13
- B-E-M-P Plan Review Fy12 booking lead time av'g: *(with all discipline av'g in parenthesis italics)*
  - 1-2 hour projects; av'g 3.77 (3.27) work day booking lead time; compares to 3.3 at 12/31/12
  - 3-4 hr projects; av'g 5.38 (4.57) work day booking lead time; compares to 7.83 at 12/31/12
  - 5-8 hr projects; av'g 7.22 (6.8) work day booking lead time; compares to 9.39 at 12/31/12
  - CTAC plan review turnaround time averaged 1.96 work days; compares to 2.74 at 12/31/12
  - Express Review booking lead; av'g of 8.16 days on small and 10.5 days on large projects
    - Vs. Ex Rev Fy13 midyear av'g of 6 days on small 7.66 days on large projects
- Residential permitting complete in 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours: 86% (4024 of 4728 permits)
  - Compares to Fy13 mid-year totals of 94% (3647 of 3865 permits)
- Documents calls answered rate: 78% (on 14,641 total calls)
  - Compares to Fy13 mid-year totals of : 88% (14,506 of 16,484 total calls).

## **7. Future BOCC - BDC Event**

Suggested by LUESA-Director as follow up to December 3 HCD Team discussion with the BOCC. On January 2, JNB sent link of Dec 3 BOCC meeting discussion on RFBA to all BDC members. LUESA and Code Enforcement leadership have discussed this at length. Believe there is an opportunity for the BDC to meet with the BOCC and discuss your work and the Department's work; so the BOCC has a better understanding of the Department's performance and service level provided to customers. Considering holding a special event allowing the BDC to engage BOCC in such a discussion; may be a working lunch session, or a session in advance of regular BDC meeting, though latter is a tough scheduling issue, since BDC and BOCC meeting dates are same. In any case, we'll do meeting agenda, but BDC will need to take the lead in the discussion. Supported by Department with stats. Format could be similar to a BDC orientation meeting.

## **8. Quarterly Reports**

### **Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report**

Because the TAB is at a watershed point in its work on sustainable design, the report includes a special report summarizing subcommittee activity progress over the last year. The 4 page report includes brief updates on topics covered in 15 meetings, covering both residential and commercial construction. On January 15, the TAB held an at large meeting among all regular and subcommittee meeting members, with 20 attendees. The meeting covered the following issues

- Origin of the sustainable incentives issue and review subcommittee activity
- Review of subcommittees work result; key points identified, other program incentives, key strategies going forward

The Department emphasized 3 points; a) this is a voluntary program, not mandatory, b) admin support should be from outside Code Enf, and c) any incentive funding should be other than permit fee based.

- Tie in to Mecklenburg Livable Communities Plan
- The meeting ended with an agreement to turn the subcommittees work into a detailed list of ideas or strategies and turn those over to the Livable Communities initiative by June, 2014.

### **Consistency Team Report**

The drop box link provided to BDC members on Thursday included the following summary with detailed backup for each meeting

- Building:
  - Bldg-Residential: met 3 times during the quarter, addressing a total of 14 questions. Contractor attendance averaged 12 at each meeting.
  - Bldg-Commercial: met twice during the quarter, addressing a total of 13 questions. There were no contractor or AE attendees at either of the meetings.

- Electrical: there were three Electrical meetings, 40 questions were addressed. 5 contractors attended the November meeting (\*\*)
  - Mechanical/Fuel Gas: there were two Mechanical/ Fuel Gas meetings, addressing 13 Mechanical items. 10 contractors attended the November meeting (\*\*)
  - Plumbing: there were two Plumbing meetings, 32 items were covered. 10 contractors attended the November meeting (\*\*)
- (\*\*) we think this indicates the fall, 2012 switch to contractor attendance at 1 of 3 quarterly meetings is working well.

## Code Compliance Report

Still using format allowing you to compare how topics & their standings change, by quarter.

- “Not ready”; Bldg – 5.57% (was 5.95%), Elec – 7.94% (was 7.17%), Mech – 5.94% (was 5.97%), plbg – 10.78% (was 9.64%)
- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
  - Bldg; rough @ 36.23% (up 1% from 35.45%), finish @ 29.26% (up 9% from 20.05%)
  - Elec; rough @ 20.98% (up a .24% from 20.74%), finish @ 55.5% (down 1.5% from 56.92%)
  - Mech; rough @ 32.68% (up 1.5% from 31.27%), finish @ 54.12% (dn 3.2% from 57.3%)
  - Plbg; rough @ 28.15% (down 3.5% from 31.78%), finish @ 39.32% (up 3% from 36.14%)
- “Top 15” repeating topics; building at 74%, Electrical at 87%, Mech at 87% and Plbg at 27%

## Commercial Plan Review Report

Part I: 69% of projects pass on 1<sup>st</sup> rev’w; 81% have passed after 2<sup>nd</sup> rev’w (both up from last quarter)

- pass rates on 1<sup>st</sup> review by trade:  
 Bldg–84% (was 83%); Elec – 83% (was 86%); Mech – 79% (was 84%); Plbg – 78% (was 85%);

Part II: most common defects: examples

- Bldg: Appendix B, egress related (7), UL assembly, passive fire protection
- Elec: services/ Feeders, general, branch circuits, grounding & bonding, ref’g eqpt, motors
- Mech: fresh air req’t, eqpt location, exhaust, duct systems, energy compliance, gas pipe size & inst’l
- Plbg: plbg syst inst’l, drainage piping, venting, minimum facilities, water distr piping & materials

Part III: 1<sup>st</sup> use of “approved as noted” (AAN) at 36% by all trades on average (same as last quarter)

- biggest users; CFD (91%) and MCFM (74%)
- critical path users; Bldg (20%, down from 28%)\_\_, Elec (20%, up from 13%)\_\_, Mech (22%, down from 14%)\_\_, Plbg (26%, down from 18%)\_\_
- So Bldg down 8%, and M-E-P all up 7-8%

## 9. Quarterly BDC Bulletin Exercise

**Previous bulletin topics:**

January, 2012
2012 NC State Building Code transition
CRWG final report
EPS-EPR startup
Permit revenue trends
Website redesign
January, 2013

April, 2012
NC Res’d Code transition
2012 NC Building Code commercial project transition rules
Code Enforcement Fy13 budget proposal
April, 2013

July, 2012
Fy2012 year end work load summary
Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC
RDS program challenges
Prelim Review policy change
Dept available for early project meetings on process
July, 2013

October, 2012
Democratic National Convention success
RDS Master Plan change
Cost Recovery Work Group changes approved by BOCC
CSS Customer survey focus group follow up work
October, 2013

ISO commercial score of '1'  BOCC approves 21 position betterment  Racking permit process discussions  Revisions to inspections auto notification	Change of BDC leadership  Lien agent legislative change  Status of 12/4/2012 betterment  Trends considered in Fy14 budget development  CTAC-EPS installation takes dept to 98% paperless	Fy14 Code Enforcement budget proposal  Economic data trends and betterment proposal  POSSE upgrade announcement  Fy14 budget technology enhancements	New BDC members  Code interp search engine goes live  Owner-developer webpage  "Starting a small business" webpage  BIM-IPD and future Department challenges
---	--	--	--

## 10. Department Statistics and Initiatives Report

- December permit (only) revenue- \$1,681,309, compares to November revenue of \$1,850,839.
- Note (\*); the December 3, 2013 BOCC approval of both RFBA's adjusted our expense and revenue picture as follows.
  - The 16 position betterment adds \$1,258,000; so new Fy13 permit revenue total of \$18,266,929
    - \$17,008,928 + \$1,258,000 = \$18,266,929
- Fy14 revised budget projected monthly permit revenue; \$18,266,929/12 = \$1,522,244
- So December permit revenue is \$159,065 above monthly projection
- At 12/31/13, YTD permit rev of \$10,661,052 is above permit fee rev projection (6 x \$1.5222M = \$9,133,464) by \$1,527,588, or 16.7%

## Construction Value of Permits Issued

- December total - \$287,676,185, compares to November total - \$337,039,703
- YTD at 12/31/13 of \$1,930,876,386; 35.9% above Fy13 constr value permit'd at 12/31/12 of \$1.421B

## Permits Issued:

	November	December	3 Month Trend
<b>Residential</b>	3658	3695	3720/4108/3658/3695
<b>Commercial</b>	2401	2288	2293/2709/2401/2288
<b>Other (Fire/Zone)</b>	480	345	424538/480/345
<b>Total</b>	6539	6328	6437/7355/6539/6328

- Residential up slightly\_\_; commercial down 4.7% \_\_; total down 4.2% \_\_
- Note; after 6 months, SF new construction permits total 1517; almost same as 1483 at 12/31/12

## Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	Nov	Dec	Insp. Perf.	Nov	Dec	% Change
<b>Bldg.</b>	5409	5282	<b>Bldg.</b>	5359	5239	-2.24%
<b>Elec.</b>	6213	6433	<b>Elec.</b>	6299	6472	+2.75%
<b>Mech.</b>	3431	3424	<b>Mech.</b>	3421	3526	+3.07%
<b>Plbg.</b>	2587	2614	<b>Plbg.</b>	2512	2645	+5.3%
<b>Total</b>	17,640	17,753	<b>Total</b>	17,591	17,882	+1.65%

- Bldg down 2%+; all other inspection counts up 2-5%
  - Note; Dec 2013 inspections were 17.3% above Dec, 2012 (2013@17,882 vs 2012@ 15,247)

- Inspections performed were 100.7% of inspections requested

### **Inspection Activity: inspections response time (IRT Report)**

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		AverageResp. in Days	
	Nov	Dec	Nov	Dec	Oct	Dec	Nov	Dec
Bldg.	88.4	91.0	91.4	92.8	98.1	97.5	1.25	1.21
Elec.	87.1	88.9	90.0	90.4	98.2	97.2	1.26	1.26
Mech.	77.2	76.9	83.2	82.0	96.9	90	1.54	1.65
Plbg.	89.1	88.1	92.3	89.8	99.6	95.8	1.21	1.32
Total	86.0	87	89.2	89.3	98.1	95.6	1.32	1.33

- Overall average above the 85-90% goal range, not considering variance identified in new POSSE CEM dash reports.
- IRT report is being replaced with new report. See discussion in item 10.2.2.3.

### **IRT comparison to POSSE Insp Efficiency Report (IER)**

- This report is now suspended.
- As discussed in item 10.2.2.3, a special report will be e-mailed to BDC-IRT Subcomm members on or before Friday, January 24. The Subcomm will hold their initial meeting on January 31.
- The summary report will present a wider array of data than we originally proposed
  - Going back 4 ½ years to July, 2009
  - Comparing IRT to IER to the new POSSE dash data
  - Adding inspection performed counts per month
  - Adding inspector population counts by trade.

### **Inspection Pass Rates for December, 2013:**

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 84.15%, compared to 82.64%, in November

**Bldg:** November – 77.56%  
 December – 77.83%

**Elec:** November – 80.39%  
 December – 83.67%

**Mech:** November – 85.63%  
 December – 85.7%

**Plbg:** November – 91.29  
 December – 91.92

- All trades ; Bldg, Mech & Plbg up <1%; Elec up 3%+
- Overall average up 1.5%, and well above 75-80% goal range

### **OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for December, 2013**

#### **CTAC:**

- 63 first reviews, compared to 131 in November.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 68%
- CTAC was 46% of OnSch (\*) first review volume ( $63/63+137 = 200$ ) = 31.5%  
 \*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:

- April, 12: 151 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- August, 12: 199 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-89.5% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 12: 118 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-96.38% all trades, 97.25% B/E/M/P only
- October, 12: 183 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-97% all trades, 98.75% B/E/M/P only
- November, 12: 141 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-92.4% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- December, 12: 150 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-93.25% all trades, 96.75% B/E/M/P only
- January, 13: 140 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-89.12% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- February, 13: 142 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-81.125% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- March, 13: 137 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-87.5% all trades, 91.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 13: 149 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-94.375% all trades, 94.5% B/E/M/P only
- May, 13: 216 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-96.375% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- June, 13: 191 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-96.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- July, 13: 197 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-90.375% all trades, 92% B/E/M/P only
- August, 13: 210 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-89.4% all trades, 93.5 B/E/M/P only
- September, 13: 203 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-89.88% all trades, 92.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 13: 218 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-88.75% all trades, 91.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 13: 207 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-95.87% all trades, 94% B/E/M/P only
- December, 13: 157 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early-96% all trades, 92.5% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on December 30, 2013, showed
  - 1-2 hr projects; at 4 work days booking lead, except CMUD – 14 days
  - 3-4 hr projects; at 4 work days lead, except CMUD – 15 days
  - 5-8 hr projects; at -3-4work days lead, except Env't Hlth – 5 days, City Zoning – 11 days and CMUD – 17 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 3 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 6 work days for small projects, 6 work days for large

## **11. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives**

**Ninety minute load test requirement: Note: actually this regards a required two hour load test**

- Background;
  - In the November BDC meeting, Ed Horne requested study of this, since it requires an IBA and Supt on site, with costs running to \$1000.
  - Dept was charged with studying options other than IBA, and also how to provide contractor with early notification of requirement, meeting with BDC rep Horne.
- On Dec 10, Gene Morton, the CEM's and Joe Weathers, held a telephone conference with Ed Horne on the subject of two hour load test requirements. The following consensus "take-aways" resulted:
  - IBA/OTI inspection is the best way to coordinate and insure all necessary personnel are present at the time of the test. Typically we will allow three hours for the test.
  - Collection of IBA/OTI fee during the permitting process was studied, but appears to have a number of administrative/accounting roadblocks and doesn't appear to work well for the customer.
  - The Department would continue meetings with inspection trades involved to come up with a SOP. We will ask if City Fire will join in the process.
  - A stamp with a note is to be added in the plan review approval stage stating that an NEC article 700 or 701 system will require the Dept. to witness a two hour load test before a TCO/ CO may be issued.
  - A friendly reminder to all industry partners will be sent out through Notify Me.

- Current status: as agreed at the December BDC meeting, we are working on the language for the stamp for plan review, writing a SOP for field inspectors. When those are in place we distribute an industry notice.

### **Temporary Utility (TU) Approval Electronic Placard Information**

As discussed with RBI reps, the problem is about lack of detailed information on the TU placard indicating the scope of the approval. Other key points on this include;

- The process we use starts with an unsigned TU placard, posted at the site by the contractor to be signed by the inspector after the on-site inspection and approval.
- The scope of the approval is recorded by the inspector in the inspection result notes. Nothing is added to the placard because the description can at times be lengthy and detailed listing multiple panels and locations.
- The proposed fix includes the following.
  - Adding some directions on the placard on how to find the details on our website.
  - Adding a QR code to the placard that would direct the smart-phone user automatically to the permit inspection records. Once there, the customer locates the inspection record matching the approval date added by the inspector on the TU placard.
- The above changes are in programming. We will notify customer when they are in place.

### **BDC-IRT Subcommittee**

- BDC volunteers include Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva, John Taylor, Ed Horne and Harry Sherrill
- On or before Jan. 24, the Dept. will send a special report to BDC volunteers, summarizing IRT performance for three different report parameters. See also item 10.1.4.2 for expanded report content.
- The first subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 31 at 9am.
- The subcommittee will address the following issues.
  - Review of the data to see if it's useful; if so, compare to old IRT-EIR data.
  - Consideration will be given to time dating when the work environment is "normal", or identifying abnormal impacts, in trying to evaluate meaningful trends, and staff sufficiency
  - Based on the data run, the subcomm will address three questions;
    - a) Does the new report meet the BDC's need? Is the data usable?
    - b) Is the current staffing level sufficient to achieve performance goals agreed to with the BDC?
    - c) Does the performance goal (85-90% of inspections complete in 1<sup>st</sup> 24 hours) still "feels right"?

### **Progress on the 2014 Service Delivery Enhancement Strategy**

- Hybrid Collaborative Delivery Team RFBA; the BOCC approved the RFBA on Dec 3.
  - The PM candidate interviews were held on January 14.
  - Project Coordinator and 8 Code Officials (plan reviewer-inspectors) are posted
  - The BIM-Navigator position is still going through HR classification.
- Customer Service Center design project;
  - Lobby customer survey was executed December 9-13, with the report delivered to Focus Group on January 7.
  - Conference calls complete with British Columbia Ministry of Natural Resources and Bellevue, WA;
    - still scheduling with Portland, OR and Jefferson County, Co
  - Conference call held on January 7 with Kirk Lindsey, Digital Customer Care Center Executive at B of A.
  - The first Novice-Infrequent Customer Focus Group meeting was held January 7 (seven customers attending); the next is scheduled for January 22. Topics being addressed include;
    - Will review all data from customer survey and other authority conference calls.
    - Will propose possible Design fix
    - What design focus group and management agree on, goes back to BDC with any related org changes (any staff count change), and proposed performance measures.

- The Subcommittee Focus Group hopes to complete the work and deliver recommendations to the BDC before the Fy15 budget planning process is complete.
- PM/CEM support pilot;
  - We completed a draft list of duties by 12/31, but need to revise it to incorporate MCFM support. We also need a meeting with the managers and staff to review/confirm; a) goals and expectations, b) duty list, and c) BDC streamlining pilot. Because of work on the NCD Team and CSC project, we've pushed the start of this pilot back to March 1

#### **Six Year Code Change Cycle Policy Change Before NC Building Code Council**

- CFD Deputy Chief Rob Kinniburgh presented to you on this in your December meeting.
- The Department continues to work with CFD, AIA-NC, PENC, fire official association reps, code official association reps, manufacturing reps and the healthcare industry to oppose the proposal.
- The BCC is tentatively planning to consider this again in their March 11 meeting
- Would the BDC consider taking a position opposed to the proposal based on the Dept. argument;
  - *this change will not save money, it will increase cost of construction and local government.*
  - *This looks like a return to the days of the "blue pages"*
  - *It is no coincidence that the "blue page" era in NC is also a time period where, in Meck County, plan review and inspection failure rates were far higher than today.*
    - *Commercial plan review 1<sup>st</sup> review failure rates 1999; 21%*
    - *Commercial plan review 1<sup>st</sup> review failure rates 2011.75%*
    - *Inspection pass rates in August 1996; overall 66%, building only 57%*
    - *Insp pass rates in Fy12 (av'g at 6/30/12); overall 85%, building only 79%*
  - *In a short time, the NC Building Code would have no relationship to the ICC model code,*
  - *This will have the following negative impact on the Department and the industry.*
    - *The cost of training will rise as ICC model code training is no longer usable. Training classes will require extensive tailoring to a peculiar set of NC requirements.*
    - *Plan review and inspections failure rates will go up, as the industry has trouble staying abreast of change the BCC makes every three months.*
    - *When failure rates go up, if we seek to maintain current performance levels, we'll need more inspectors and plan reviewers to keep up, and service cost will rise*
    - *When the industry has trouble staying abreast of change the BCC makes every three months, errors will be made in field installations, tear out will be required to comply with the code and construction cost will increase accordingly.*

#### **Board Rule Amendment Proposal on AE Seal Use within BIM-IPD**

- As previously reported to the BDC, CHS and Meck are jointly participating on an NC AE Board pilot on how AE seal use works inside BIM-IPD projects.
  - Both Boards approved a Pilot Program Proposal (3/12/2013, rev 4/5/2013) submitted last spring.
  - On October 2, the CHS & Meck jointly submitted the first 6-month report
  - At the request of NC B Arch members, on December 6 we submitted a draft Board Rule amendment proposal to representatives from both Boards.
- On February 13, the Boards will hold a joint meeting in Raleigh to consider the amendment proposal.
  - CHS & Meck will jointly present the Board rule amendment concept.

#### **LUESA-University Event Scheduled for March 4.**

- This is an event important to the LUESA Director, especially regarding all LUESA staff understanding the full range of activities engaged in by the five LUESA agencies (CE, AQ, W&LR, SW & Env't Health).
- This will be an all-day event for all staff, so wrestling with how to address service on that day.
- Two options;
  - a) treat the same as a "teacher work day", shutting down for the day, except for emergencies.
  - b) stay open, but run a skeletal counter staff from about 9am-1pm.



- All staff would attend the event from roughly 9am thru 12:45.
  - So it would be like a work day with a super long training event in it.
- BDC preference?
- BDC members are welcome to attend the event at UNCC.

## **12. Manager/CA Added Comments**

No manager comments

## **13. Adjournment**

The January 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2014.